

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

RECEIVED

OCT 2 8 2002

In re P	atent	Application of)			TECH CENTER 1600/2900	
Theres	e de	BIZEMONT et al.)	Group Art Unit:	1635	TEON OLIVIER TOOGHOOD	
Application No.: 09/836,439)	Examiner: Richard A. Schnizer			
Filed:	Apr	il 17, 2001)	Confirmation No.	: 5851		
For:	OL BY	THERAPY WITH CHIMERIC LIGONUCLEOTIDES DELIVERED A METHOD COMPRISING A STEP FIONTOPHORESIS))))				
	RI	ESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQU	IRI	EMENT TRANSM	IITTAL L	ETTER	
		Commissioner for Patents n, D.C. 20231					
Sir:				,			
E	Enclosed is a Response to Restriction Requirement for the above-identified patent application.						
[[] A Petition for Extension of Time is also enclosed.						
[[] A Terminal Disclaimer and a check for [] \$55.00 (2814) [] \$110.00 (1814) to cover the requisite Government fee are also enclosed.						
[[] Also enclosed is						
[Small entity status is hereby claimed.						
[]	Applicant(s) request continued examination under 37 C.F.R. § 1.114 and enclose the [] \$370.00 (2801) [] \$740.00 (1801) fee due under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(e).					
		[] Applicant(s) previously submitted requested.		, on, for which	continued (examination is	
ĺ	Applicant(s) request suspension of action by the Office until at least _, which does not exceed three months from the filing of this RCE, in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.103(c). The required fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(i) is enclosed.						
1	[]	A Request for Entry and Consideration (146/246) is also enclosed.	of	Submission under	37 C.F.R.	§ 1.129(a)	
	[X]	No additional claim fee is required.					

[] An additional claim fee is required, and is calculated as shown below:

		AMENDED	CLAIM	S	
	No. OF CLAIMS	HIGHEST NO. OF CLAIMS PREVIOUSLY PAID FOR	EXTRA CLAIMS	RATE	ADDT'L FEE
Total Claims		MINUS =		× \$18.00 (1202) =	
Independent Claims		MINUS =		× \$84.00 (1201) =	
If Amendment adds m	ultiple depend	dent claims, add \$28	30.00 (1203)		
Total Amendment Fee					
If small entity status is claimed, subtract 50% of Total Amendment Fee					
TOTAL ADDITION	AL FEE DUI	E FOR THIS AME	NDMENT		

[]	A claim fee	in the amount of \$	is enclosed.
ſ	1	Charge \$	to Deposit Account N	o. 02-4800.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16, 1.17, 1.20(d) and 1.21 that may be required by this paper, and to credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 02-4800. This paper is submitted in duplicate.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Deborah H. Yel

Registration No. 45,904

P.O. Box 1404 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404 (703) 836-6620

Date: October 24, 2002

15 | R.T.
10/30
ELECTION
Patent

Attorney's Docket No. 017753-

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE RECEIVED

In re Patent Application of:		OCT 2 8 2002	
Therese de BIZEMONT <i>et al.</i>	Group Art Unit: 1635	TECH CENTER 1600/2900	
Application No.: 09/836,439	Examiner: Richard A. Schnizer		
Filed: April 17, 2001	Confirmation No.: 5851	·	
For: GENE THERAPY WITH CHIMERIC) OLIGONUCLEOTIDES) DELIVERED BY A METHOD) COMPRISING A STEP OF)			

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Assistant Commissioner for Patents Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

This Response to Restriction Requirement is in complete response to the Official Action (Restriction Requirement) mailed on September 24, 2002 (Paper No. 14). This Response is timely filed by the October 24, 2002 due date.

The Examiner has required the election of a single Group, to which the claims will be restricted if no generic claim is held to be allowable. Applicants hereby elect, with traverse, Group I (i.e., claims 1-21), drawn to methods of delivering an oligonucleotide *in vivo* to cells of an animal by iontophoresis.

Turning now to the restriction requirement, Applicants respectfully traverse.

For the reasons set forth below, Applicants request that the restriction requirement be modified so that the inventions of Groups I-IX will be examined together.

Under M.P.E.P. § 803, a restriction is proper if the subject matter can be restricted into one of two or more claimed inventions, and these inventions are either independent (M.P.E.P. § 806.04) or distinct (M.P.E.P. § 806.05). However, the second element for a restriction requirement to be proper is that if the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the examiner *must* examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to independent and distinct inventions. Applicants submit that a search of each Group as set forth in the outstanding Office Action would not be burdensome to the Examiner. All of the claims relate to chimeric oligonucleotides delivered via iontophoresis. A search for those claims directed to the chimeric oligonucleotide would overlap a search for claims directed to methods of using these name oligonulceotides.

Furthermore, the Office has not set forth an explanation of how a search of the claimed invention would be burdensome. Accordingly, Applicants assert that a proper restriction under M.P.E.P. § 803 has not been set forth with regard to the originally presented claims, the elections herein are provisional. The restriction should be withdrawn or, at the very least, reconsidered.

Withdrawal of the restriction requirement and rejoinder of the claims of Groups I-XV, and further and favorable consideration of all the claims of record on the merits is respectfully requested.

Application No. <u>09/836,439</u> Attorney's Docket No. <u>017753-154</u> Page 3

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that the present application is fully in condition for examination. An early examination on the merits is earnestly solicited.

In the event that there are any questions relating to this application, it would be appreciated if the Examiner would telephone the undersigned concerning such questions so that prosecution of this application may be expedited.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Bv.

Deborah H. Yellin

Registration No. 45,904

P.O. Box 1404 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404 (703) 836-6620

Date: October 24, 2002